arXiv:1404.7533v2 [cs.FL] 16 Oct 2014

Recognizable Series on Hypergraphs

Raphaël BAILLY François DENIS Guillaume RABUSSEAU*

October 17, 2014

Abstract

We introduce the notion of *Hypergraph Weighted Model* (HWM) that generically associates a tensor network to a hypergraph and then computes a value by tensor contractions directed by its hyperedges. A series r defined on a hypergraph family is said to be recognizable if there exists a HWM that computes it. This model generalizes the notion of rational series on strings and trees. We prove some properties of the model and study at which conditions finite support series are recognizable.

1 Introduction

Real-valued functions whose domains are composed of syntactical structures, such as strings, trees or graphs, are widely used in computer science. One way to handle them is by means of rational series that use automata devices to jointly analyze the structure of the input and compute its image. Rational series have been defined for strings and trees, but their extension to graphs is challenging.

On the other hand, rational series have an equivalent algebraic characterization by means of linear (or multi-linear) representations. We show in this paper that this last formalism can be naturally extended to graphs (and hypergraphs) by associating tensors to the vertices of the graph.

More precisely, we define the notion of *Hypergraph Weighted Model* (HWM), a computational model that generically associates a tensor network to a hypergraph and that computes a value by successive generalized tensor contractions directed by its hyperedges. We say that a series r defined on a hypergraph family is HWM-recognizable if there exists a HWM M that computes it: we then denote r by r_M. We first show that HWM-recognizable series defined on strings or trees exactly recover the classical notion of recognizable series. We present two closure properties: if r and s are two recognizable series defined on a family $\mathcal{H}$ of connected hypergraphs, then $r + s$ and $r \cdot s$, respectively defined for all graph $G \in \mathcal{H}$ by $(r+s)(G) = r(G)+s(G)$ and $(r \cdot s)(G) = r(G)s(G)$ (the Hadamard product), are HWM-recognizable.

Recognizable series on strings and trees include polynomials, i.e. finite support series. This is not always the case for recognizable series defined on more general families of hypergraphs. For example, we show that finite support series are not recognizable on the family of circular strings. The main reason is that if a recognizable series is not null on some hypergraph G, it must be also different from zero on *tilings* of G, i.e. connected graphs made of copies of G. We show that if a graph family is tiling-free, then finite support series are recognizable. Strings and trees, as any family of rooted hypergraphs, are tiling-free.

String rational series and weighted automaton have their roots in automata theory [9, 16] and their study can be found in [4, 8, 11, 14, 15]. The extension of rational series and weighted automaton to trees is presented in [3, 8]. Spectral methods for inference of stochastic languages of strings/trees have been developed upon the notion of linear representation of a rational series

*rbailly@lsi.upc.edu, {francois.denis, guillaume.rabusseau}@lif.univ-mrs.fr

([2, 7] for example). Tensor networks emerged in the theory of brain functions [13], they have been used in quantum theory (see for example [12]), and the interest for these objects has recently been growing in other fields (e.g. data mining [5]).

We recall notions on tensors and hypergraphs in Section 2, we introduce the Hypergraph Weighted Model and present some of its properties in section 3, we introduce the notion of tilings and we study the recognizability of finite support series in Section 4, we provide some examples in Section **??** and we then propose a short conclusion.

Most of the proofs have been omitted for brevity but can be found in [1].

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Recognizable Series on Strings and Trees

We refer to [3, 4, 6, 8, 14] for notions about recognizable series on strings and trees, and we briefly recall below some basic definitions.

Let Σ be a finite *alphabet*, and Σ^* be the set of strings on Σ. A *series* on Σ^* is a mapping $r : \Sigma^* \to \mathbb{K}$ where $\mathbb{K}$ is a semiring. A series r is *recognizable* if there exists a tuple $\langle V, \boldsymbol{\iota}, \{\mathbf{M}_x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}\rangle$ where $V = \mathbb{K}^d$ for some integer $d \geq 1$, $\boldsymbol{\iota}, \boldsymbol{\tau} \in V$ and $\mathbf{M}_x \in \mathbb{K}^{d\times d}$ for each symbol $x \in \Sigma$, such that for any $u_1 \dots u_n \in \Sigma^*$, $r(u_1 \dots u_n) = \boldsymbol{\iota}^\top \mathbf{M}_{u_1} \dots \mathbf{M}_{u_n} \boldsymbol{\tau}$. In this paper, we will only consider the case where $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$.

A *ranked* alphabet $\mathcal{F}$ is a tuple $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ where Σ is a finite alphabet and where $\sharp$ maps each symbol x of Σ to an integer $\sharp x$ called its *arity*; for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let us denote $\mathcal{F}_k = \sharp^{-1}(\{k\})$. A ranked alphabet is *positive* if $\sharp$ takes its values in $\mathbb{N}_+$.

The set of trees over a ranked alphabet $\mathcal{F}$ is denoted by $T(\mathcal{F})$. A *tree series* on $T(\mathcal{F})$ is a mapping $r : T(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathbb{K}$. A series r is *recognizable* if there exists a tuple $\langle V, \mu, \boldsymbol{\lambda}\rangle$, where $V = \mathbb{K}^d$ for some integer $d \geq 1$, μ maps each $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ to a p-multilinear mapping $\mu(f) \in \mathcal{L}(V^p; V)$ for each $p \geq 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in V$, such that $r(t) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mu(t)$ for all t in $T(\mathcal{F})$, where $\mu(t) \in V$ is inductively defined by $\mu(f(t_1, \dots, t_p)) = \mu(f)(\mu(t_1), \dots, \mu(t_p))$.

2.2 Tensors

Let $d \geq 1$ be an integer, $V = \mathbb{K}^d$ where $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ and let $(\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_d)$ be the canonical basis of V. A tensor $\mathfrak{T} \in \bigotimes^k V = V \otimes \dots \otimes V$ (k times) can uniquely be expressed as a linear combination

$$\mathfrak{T} = \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k\in[d]} \mathfrak{T}_{i_1\dots i_k} \mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_{i_k}$$

(where $[d] = \{1, \cdots, d\}$) of *pure tensors* $\mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_{i_k}$ which form a basis of $\bigotimes^k V$ [10]. Hence, the tensor $\mathfrak{T}$ can be represented as the multi-array $(\mathfrak{T}_{i_1\dots i_k})$.

Definition 1. *The* tensor product *of $\mathfrak{T} \in \bigotimes^p V$ and $\mathfrak{U} \in \bigotimes^q V$ is the tensor $\mathfrak{T} \otimes \mathfrak{U} \in \bigotimes^{p+q} V$ defined by*

$$(\mathfrak{T} \otimes \mathfrak{U})_{i_1\cdots i_p j_1 \cdots j_q} = \mathfrak{T}_{i_1\cdots i_p} \mathfrak{U}_{j_1\cdots j_q}.$$

For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{K}^d$, let $\mathbf{v}^{\otimes k} = \mathbf{v} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k\in[d]} v_{i_1} \dots v_{i_k} \mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_{i_k}$ denote its k-th tensor power.

Let $\odot : V \times V \to V$ be an associative and symmetric bilinear mapping: $\forall u, v, w \in V, u \odot v = v \odot u$ and $u \odot (v \odot w) = (u \odot v) \odot w$. The mapping $\odot$ is called a *product*.

Remark 1. *Let $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top$ and let $\odot_{id}$ be defined by $\mathbf{e}_i \odot_{id} \mathbf{e}_j = \delta_{ij}\mathbf{e}_i$, where δ is the Kronecker symbol: $\odot_{id}$ is called the* identity product*.*

The operation of applying the linear form $\mathbf{v} \mapsto \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{v}$ to the identity product $\mathbf{a} \odot_{id} \mathbf{b}$ of two vectors is related to the notions of generalized trace *and* contraction*: if $\mathcal{A} = \sum_{i,j\in[d]} \mathcal{A}_{i,j} \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j$*



Figure 1: The hypergraph G from example 1.



Figure 2: Graph associated with a string $u = u_1 \cdots u_n$ (where the notation $i : x$ means that $\ell(i) = x$)

is a 2-order tensor over $\mathbb{K}^d$ (i.e. a square matrix), $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i,j\in[d]} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{i,j}\mathbf{e}_i \odot_{id} \mathbf{e}_j$ is the diagonal vector of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top\mathbf{v}$ is its trace. Furthermore, if $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{i,j\in[d]} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{i,j}\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{i,j\in[d]} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{i,j}\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j$ are 2-order tensors over $\mathbb{K}^d$, then $\sum_{i,j,k,l} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{i,j}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{k,l}\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}^\top(\mathbf{e}_j \odot_{id} \mathbf{e}_k) \otimes \mathbf{e}_l = \sum_{i,j,l} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{i,j}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{j,l}\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_l$ is the tensor form of the matrix product $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}$ (i.e. the contraction of the tensor $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}$ along its 2nd and 3rd modes).

2.3 Hypergraphs

Definition 2. *A hypergraph $G = (V, E, l)$ over a positive ranked alphabet $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ is given by a non empty finite set V, a mapping $l : V \to \Sigma$ and a partition $E = (h_k)_{1\leq k\leq n_E}$ of $P_G = \{(v, j) : v \in V, 1 \leq j \leq \sharp v\}$ where $\sharp v = \sharp l(v)$.*

V is the set of *vertices*, P_G is the set of *ports* and E is the set of *hyperedges* of G. The arity of a symbol x is equal to to the number of ports of any vertex labelled by x. We will sometimes use the notation $v^{(i)}$ for the port $(v, i) \in P_G$. A hypergraph G can be represented as a bipartite graph where vertices from one partite set represent the vertices of G, and vertices from the other represent its hyperedges (see Figure 1). A hypergraph is *connected* if for any partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, there exists a hyperedge $h \in E$ and ports $v_1^{(i)}, v_2^{(j)} \in h$ s.t. $v_1 \in V_1$ and $v_2 \in V_2$. A hypergraph is a *graph* if $|h| \leq 2$ for all $h \in E$, and a hypergraph is *closed* if $|h| \geq 2$ for all $h \in E$.

Example 1. *Over the ranked alphabet $\{(a, 3), (b, 2)\}$, let $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, $l(v_1) = l(v_3) = a$, $l(v_2) = b$, $E = \{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4\}$ where $h_1 = \{v_1^{(1)}, v_3^{(3)}\}$, $h_2 = \{v_1^{(2)}, v_2^{(1)}, v_3^{(2)}\}$, $h_3 = \{v_1^{(3)}, v_2^{(2)}\}$ and $h_4 = \{v_3^{(1)}\}$ (see Figure 1).*

Example 2. *A string $u = u_1 \dots u_n$ over an alphabet Σ can be seen as a (hyper)graph over the ranked alphabet $(\Sigma \cup \{\iota, \tau\}, \sharp)$ where $\sharp x = 2$ for any $x \in \Sigma$ and $\sharp\iota = \sharp\tau = 1$. Let $V = \{0, \cdots, n+1\}$, $l(0) = \iota$, $l(n + 1) = \tau$ and $l(i) = u_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $E = \{h_0, h_1, \dots, h_n\}$ where $h_0 = \{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}$ and $h_i = \{(i, 2), (i + 1, 1)\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ (see Figure 2). The set of strings Σ^* gives rise to a family of hypergraphs.*

Example 3. *Similarly, we can associate any tree t over a ranked alphabet $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ with a graph G_t on the ranked alphabet $(\Sigma \cup \{\lambda\}, \sharp')$ where $\sharp'(f) = \sharp f + 1$ for any $f \in \Sigma$, and where the special symbol λ of arity 1 is connected to the free port of the vertex corresponding to the root of t.*

Formally, let $\mathcal{F} = (\Sigma, \sharp)$ be a ranked alphabet. A tree t over $\mathcal{F}$ can be defined as a mapping from a finite non-empty prefix-closed set $Pos(t) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ to $\mathcal{F}$, satisfying the following conditions: (i)



Figure 3: (left) Hypergraph G_t associated with the tree $t = f(a, f(a, a))$. (right) Example of circular string on the alphabet $\{a, b\}$

$\forall p \in Pos(t)$, *if* $t(p) \in \mathcal{F}_n, n \geq 1$, *then* $\{j | p \cdot j \in Pos(t)\} = \{1, ..., n\}$, *(ii)* $\forall p \in Pos(t)$, *if* $t(p) \in \mathcal{F}_0$, *then* $\{j | p \cdot j \in Pos(t)\} = \emptyset$.

A tree t *over* $\mathcal{F}$ *can be seen as a hypergraph over the ranked alphabet* $(\Sigma \cup \{\lambda\}, \sharp')$ *where* $\sharp'(\lambda) = 1$ *and* $\sharp'(f) = \sharp f + 1$ *for any* $f \in \Sigma$. *Let* $V = Pos(t) \cup \{0\}$, $l(0) = \lambda$ *and* $l(p) = t(p)$ *for any* $p \in Pos(t)$. *Let* $E = \{\{(0, 1), (\varepsilon, 1)\}\} \cup \bigcup_{p.j \in Pos(t)} \{\{(p, j + 1), (p.j, 1)\}\}$. *The set of trees* $T(\mathcal{F})$ *gives rise to a family of hypergraphs. The graph associated with the tree* $t = f(a, f(a, a))$ *is shown as an example in Figure 3.*

Example 4. *Given a finite alphabet* Σ, *let* $\mathcal{F} = (\Sigma, \sharp)$ *be the ranked alphabet where* $\sharp x = 2$ *for each* $x \in \Sigma$. *We say that a hypergraph* $G = (V, E)$ *on* $\mathcal{F}$ *is a circular string if and only if* G *is connected and every hyperedge* $h \in E$ *is of the form* $h = \{(v, 2), (w, 1)\}$ *for* $v, w \in V$ *(see Figure 3).*

Example 5. *An other interesting extension of strings (naturally modeled by graphs) is the set of 2D-words* $w \in \Sigma^{M \times N}$ *on a finite alphabet* Σ, *see Section 5.3 for details.*

3 Hypergraph Weighted Models

3.1 Definition

In this section, we give the formal definition of Hypergraph Weighted Models. We then explain how to compute its value for a given hypergraph.

Definition 3. *A rank* d *Hypergraph Weighted Model (HWM) on a ranked alphabet* $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ *is a tuple* $M = \langle V_M, \{\mathfrak{T}^x\}_{x \in \Sigma}, \odot, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle$ *where* $V_M = \mathbb{K}^d$, $\odot$ *is a product on* V_M, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in V_M$, *and* $\{\mathfrak{T}^x\}_{x \in \Sigma}$ *is a family of tensors where each* $\mathfrak{T}^x \in \bigotimes^{\sharp x} V_M$.

Let $G = (V, E, l)$ *be a hypergraph and let* $\Gamma = [d]^{P_G}$ *be the set of mappings from* P_G *to* $[d]$. *The* series r_M *computed by the HWM* M *is defined by*

$$r_M(G) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{T}_\gamma \prod_{h \in E} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{i \in \gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i$$

where $\mathfrak{T}_\gamma = \prod_{v \in V} \mathfrak{T}^v_{\gamma(v^{(1)}) \ldots \gamma(v^{(\sharp v)})}$ *(using the notation* $\mathfrak{T}^v = \mathfrak{T}^{l(v)}$*).*

Let $V = \{v_1, \cdots, v_n\}$. The tensor $\mathfrak{T}^{v_1} \otimes \mathfrak{T}^{v_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathfrak{T}^{v_n}$ is of order $|P_G|$, and any element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ can be seen as a multi-index of $[d]^{|P_G|}$. Thus, $\mathfrak{T}_\gamma$ is the $\left(\gamma(v_1^{(1)}), \cdots, \gamma(v_1^{(\sharp v_1)}), \cdots, \gamma(v_n^{(1)}), \cdots, \gamma(v_n^{(\sharp v_n)})\right)$-coordinate of the tensor $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{T}^{v_i}$.

Example 6. *Consider the hypergraph G from Example 1. We have*

$$r_M(G) = \sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_8} \mathfrak{T}^a_{i_1 i_2 i_3} \mathfrak{T}^b_{i_4 i_5} \mathfrak{T}^a_{i_6 i_7 i_8} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\mathbf{e}_{i_1} \odot \mathbf{e}_{i_8}) \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\mathbf{e}_{i_2} \odot \mathbf{e}_{i_4} \odot \mathbf{e}_{i_7}) \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\mathbf{e}_{i_3} \odot \mathbf{e}_{i_5}) \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{e}_{i_6}.$$

Remark 2. *If $\odot = \odot_{id}$ and if $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{1}$, then $r_M(G) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{Id}} \mathfrak{T}_\gamma$ where $\Gamma_{Id} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \forall h \in E, p, q \in h \Rightarrow \gamma(p) = \gamma(q)\}$. For the hypergraph G from Example 1, this would lead to the following contractions of the tensor $\mathfrak{T}^a \otimes \mathfrak{T}^b \otimes \mathfrak{T}^a$:*

$$r_M(G) = \sum_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_6} \mathfrak{T}^a_{i_1 i_2 i_3} \mathfrak{T}^b_{i_2 i_3} \mathfrak{T}^a_{i_6 i_2 i_1}$$

Remark 3. *Let Σ be a finite alphabet, let $\mathbf{M}_\sigma \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and let $A = \langle \mathbb{K}^d, \{\mathbf{M}_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}, \odot_{id}, \mathbf{1} \rangle$ be a HWM. For any non empty word $w = w_1 \cdots w_n \in \Sigma^*$ and its corresponding circular string G_w, it follows from Remark 1 that $r_A(G_w) = Tr(\mathbf{M}_{w_1} \cdots \mathbf{M}_{w_n})$ (where $Tr(\mathbf{M})$ is the trace of the matrix $\mathbf{M}$).*

Remark 4. *Let $A = \langle \mathbb{R}^d, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x\}_{x \in \Sigma}, \odot, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle$ be a HWM. Each tensor $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x$ can be decomposed as a sum of rank one tensors $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x = \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r^{(x,1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{a}_r^{(x,\sharp x)}$ where R is the maximum rank of the tensors $\mathfrak{T}^x$ for $x \in \Sigma$. The computation of the HWM A on $G = (V, E, \ell)$ can then be written as $r(G) = \prod_{h \in E} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \left[\bigodot_{(v,i) \in h} \left(\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r^{(\ell(v),i)} \right) \right]$.*

Remark 5. *If G is a hypergraph with two connected components G_1 and G_2, we have $r_M(G) = r_M(G_1) \cdot r_M(G_2)$ for any HWM M.*

Definition 4. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a family of hypergraphs on a ranked alphabet $(\Sigma, \sharp)$. We say that a hypergraph series $r : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{K}$ is recognizable if and only if there exists a HWM M such that $r_M(G) = r(G)$ for all $G \in \mathcal{H}$.*

3.2 Properties

In this section, we show that HWMs satisfy some basic properties which are desirable for a model extending the notion of recognizable series to hypergraphs.

The following propositions show that the proposed model naturally generalizes the notion of linear representation of recognizable series on strings and trees.

Proposition 1. *Let $r = \langle V, \boldsymbol{\iota}, \{\mathbf{M}^\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle$ be a recognizable series on Σ^*. For any word $w \in \Sigma^*$, let G_w be the associated hypergraph on the ranked alphabet $(\Sigma \cup \{\iota, \tau\}, \sharp)$, whose construction is described in Example 2. Consider the HWM $M = \langle V, \{\mathfrak{T}^x\}_{x \in \Sigma \cup \{\iota,\tau\}}, \odot_{id}, \mathbf{1} \rangle$ where $\mathfrak{T}^\tau = \boldsymbol{\tau}$, $\mathfrak{T}^\iota = \boldsymbol{\iota}$ and $\mathfrak{T}^\sigma = \mathbf{M}^\sigma$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$.*

Then, $r(w) = r_M(G_w)$ for all strings $w \in \Sigma^*$.

Proof. Let $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} r(w) = \boldsymbol{\iota}^\top \mathbf{M}^{w_1} \cdots \mathbf{M}^{w_n} \boldsymbol{\tau} &= \sum_{i_0,\ldots,i_n} \boldsymbol{\iota}_{i_0} \mathbf{M}^{w_1}_{i_0,i_1} \ldots \mathbf{M}^{w_1}_{i_{n-1},i_n} \boldsymbol{\tau}_{i_n} \\ &= \sum_{i_0,\ldots,i_n} \mathfrak{T}^\iota_{i_0} \mathfrak{T}^{w_1}_{i_0,i_1} \ldots \mathfrak{T}^{w_n}_{i_{n-1},i_n} \mathfrak{T}^\tau_{i_n} = r_M(G_w). \end{aligned}$$

□

In the previous proposition, the vectors $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ of a linear representation were directly encoded in the structure of the graph representation of a string w on Σ using the new symbols ι and τ. The next proposition shows that it is possible to encode these linear forms in the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ of a

HWM with complex coefficients, using a graph representation of strings without new symbols: for any string $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ over Σ, we consider the graph $H_w = (V, E, \ell)$ on $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ where $V = [n]$, $\ell(i) = w_i$ and the set of hyperedges is composed of $\{(1,1)\}$, $\{(n,2)\}$ and $\{(i,2),(i+1,1)\}$ for $i \in [n-1]$ (note that the graph representation of a string is different from the graph representation of its mirror because of the identification of the ports).

Proposition 2. *Let $r = \langle \mathbb{R}^d, \boldsymbol{\iota}, \{\mathbf{M}_\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}\rangle$ be a recognizable string series on Σ^*. There exists a HWM $M = \langle \mathbb{C}^d, \{\mathfrak{T}^\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \odot\rangle$ such that $r_M(H_w) = r(w)$ for all $w \in \Sigma^*$.*

Proof. We first show that given a recognizable string series $r = \langle \mathbb{R}^d, \boldsymbol{\iota}, \{\mathbf{M}^\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}\rangle$ there exists a recognizable series $s = \langle \mathbb{C}^d, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \{\mathbf{N}^\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle$ such that $s(w) = r(w)$ for all $w \in \Sigma^*$. Indeed, let $(\mathbf{e}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{e}_d)$ be a basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathbf{e}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\tau} \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{e}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\iota} \neq 0$ for all $i \in [d]$. Let $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times d}$ be the diagonal matrix defined by $\mathbf{D}_{ii} = (\mathbf{e}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\tau})^{1/2}/(\mathbf{e}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\iota})^{1/2}$. We have $\mathbf{D}^\top \boldsymbol{\iota} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and the series $s : \langle \mathbb{C}^d, \mathbf{D}^\top \boldsymbol{\iota}, \mathbf{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}, \{\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{M}^\sigma\mathbf{D}\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}\rangle$ is such that $s(w) = r(w)$ for all $w \in \Sigma^*$.

We then have that the HWM $M = \langle \mathbb{C}^d, \{\mathfrak{T}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \odot\rangle$, where $\mathfrak{T}^\sigma = \mathbf{M}^\sigma$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{D}^\top\boldsymbol{\iota} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and $\odot$ is defined by $\mathbf{e}_i \odot \mathbf{e}_j = \delta_{ij}\frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i}\mathbf{e}_i$, is such that $r_M(H_w) = r(w)$ for all $w \in \Sigma^*$. □

Proposition 3. *Let $r = \langle V, \mu, \lambda\rangle$ be a recognizable series on trees on the ranked alphabet $\mathcal{F} = (\Sigma, \sharp)$. For any tree t over $\mathcal{F}$, let $G^t = (V_t, E_t)$ be the associated hypergraph on the ranked alphabet $(\Sigma \cup \{\lambda\}, \sharp')$, whose construction is described in Example 3. Consider the HWM $M : \langle V, \{\mathfrak{T}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma\cup\{\lambda\}}, \odot_{id}, \mathbf{1}\rangle$ where $\mathfrak{T}^\lambda = \lambda$ and $\mathfrak{T}^f$ is defined by $\mathfrak{T}^f_{i_0\dots i_k} = \mathbf{e}_{i_0}^\top \mu(f)(\mathbf{e}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{i_k})$ for all k and $f \in \mathcal{F}_k$.*

Then, $r(t) = r_M(G^t)$ for all tree t over $\mathcal{F}$.

Proof. For any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Id}$, let $\mathfrak{U}_\gamma = \prod_{v\in V_t\setminus\{0\}} \mathfrak{T}^{l(v)}_{\gamma(v,1)\dots\gamma(v,\sharp v)}$. We first prove by induction on t that $\mu(t) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{Id}} \mathfrak{U}_\gamma \mathbf{e}_{\gamma(\epsilon,1)}$.

If $t = a$, then $\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{Id}} \mathfrak{U}_\gamma \mathbf{e}_{\gamma(\epsilon,1)} = \sum_{i\in[d]} \mathfrak{T}^a_i \mathbf{e}_i = \mu(a)$.

If $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_k)$, first remark that $\Gamma_{Id} = \Gamma^{(0)}_{Id} \times \Gamma^{(1)}_{Id} \times \cdots \times \Gamma^{(k)}_{Id}$, where $\Gamma^{(0)}_{Id}$ fixes the values of the port $(\epsilon, 1)$ and where $\Gamma^{(j)}_{Id}$, for $j \in [k]$, fixes the values of the ports of the subgraph corresponding to the subtree t_j.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu(f(t_1,\dots,t_k)) &= \mu(f)(\mu(t_1),\dots,\mu(t_k)) \\
&= \sum_{i_0,i_1,\dots,i_k} \mathfrak{T}^f_{i_0,i_1,\dots,i_n} \prod_{j\in[k]} \mathbf{e}_{i_j}^\top \mu(t_j)\mathbf{e}_{i_0} \\
&= \sum_{i_0,i_1,\dots,i_k} \mathfrak{T}^f_{i_0,i_1,\dots,i_n} \prod_{j\in[k]} \mathbf{e}_{i_j}^\top \left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{(j)}_{Id}} \mathfrak{U}_\gamma \mathbf{e}_{\gamma(j,1)}\right) \mathbf{e}_{i_0} \\
&= \sum_{i_0,i_1,\dots,i_k} \mathfrak{T}^f_{i_0,i_1,\dots,i_n} \prod_{j\in[k]} \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{(j)}_{Id},\gamma(j,1)=i_j} \mathfrak{U}_\gamma \mathbf{e}_{i_0} \\
&= \sum_{i_0,\gamma_1\in\Gamma^{(1)}_{Id},\dots,\gamma_k\in\Gamma^{(k)}_{Id}} \mathfrak{T}^f_{i_0,\gamma_1(1,1),\dots,\gamma_k(k,1)} \prod_{j\in[k]} \mathfrak{U}_{\gamma_j}\mathbf{e}_{i_0} = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{Id}} \mathfrak{U}_\gamma \mathbf{e}_{\gamma(\epsilon,1)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

It is then easy to check that

$$
\lambda(\mu(t)) = \sum_i \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{Id}} \mathfrak{T}^\lambda_i \mathfrak{U}_\gamma \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{e}_{\gamma(\epsilon,1)} = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{Id}} \mathfrak{T}^\lambda_{\gamma(\epsilon,1)} \mathfrak{U}_\gamma = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{Id}} \mathfrak{T}_\gamma = r_M(t).
$$

□

The following propositions show that the set of HWMs is closed under addition and Hadamard product.

Proposition 4. *Let $A = \langle \mathbb{K}^m, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot_A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle$, and $B = \langle \mathbb{K}^n, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot_B, \boldsymbol{\beta}\rangle$ be two HWMs. Let r_A (resp. r_B) be the series computed by A (resp. by B).Define the HWM $C = \langle \mathbb{K}^{m+n}, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot, \tau\rangle$ by*

- $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}^x_{i_1\dots i_{\sharp x}} = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x_{i_1\dots i_{\sharp x}} & \text{if } 1 \le i_1, \dots, i_{\sharp x} \le m \\ \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^x_{j_1\dots j_{\sharp x}} & \text{if } m < i_1, \dots, i_{\sharp x} \le m+n \text{ where } j_k = i_k - m \text{ for any } k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
- $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$ *if* $1 \le i \le m$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i-m}$ *otherwise, and*
- $\mathbf{e}_i \odot \mathbf{e}_j = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_i \odot_A \mathbf{e}_j & \text{if } 1 \le i, j \le m \\ t_m(\mathbf{e}_{i-m} \odot_B \mathbf{e}_{j-m}) & \text{if } m < i, j \le n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

where $t_m : \mathbb{K}^n \to \mathbb{K}^{m+n}$ is the linear mapping defined by $t_m(\mathbf{e}_k) = \mathbf{e}_{k+m}$ for any $1 \le k \le n$.

Then the HWM C computes the series r_{A+B} defined by $r_{A+B}(G) = r_A(G) + r_B(G)$, for any connected hypergraph G.

Proof. Let P_G be the set of ports of G, let $\Gamma = [m+n]^{P_G}$, $\Gamma_1 = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma(P_G) \subseteq [m]\}$ and $\Gamma_2 = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma(P_G) \subseteq \{m+1, \dots, m+n\}\}$.

If $\gamma \notin \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}_\gamma \prod_{h\in P_G} \tau^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i = 0$. Indeed, let $V_1 = \{v \in V : \exists v^{(i)} \in P_G \text{ s.t. } \gamma(v^{(i)}) \le m\}$ and $V_2 = \{v \in V : \exists v^{(i)} \in P_G \text{ s.t. } \gamma(v^{(i)}) > m\}$. Note that V_1 and V_2 are not empty.

- If there exists $v \in V_1 \cap V_2$, then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}^v_{\gamma(v,1)\dots\gamma(v,\sharp v)} = 0$ and therefore $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}_\gamma = 0$
- If $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$, there exists a hyperedge h and ports $v_1^{(i)}, v_2^{(j)} \in h$ such that $v_1 \in V_1$ and $v_2 \in V_2$, since G is connected. Then, $\bigodot_{i\in\gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i = 0$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} r_C(G) &= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}_\gamma \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\tau}^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_1} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}_\gamma \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\tau}^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_2} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}_\gamma \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\tau}^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_A} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_\gamma \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_B} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_\gamma \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma(h)} \mathbf{e}_i \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_A = [m]^{P_G}$ and $\Gamma_B = [n]^{P_G}$. Eventually, $r_C(G) = r_A(G) + r_B(G)$. □

Proposition 5. *Let $A = \langle \mathbb{K}^m, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot^A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle$ and $B = \langle \mathbb{K}^n, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot^B, \boldsymbol{\beta}\rangle$ be two HWMs.*

Identifying $\mathbb{K}^m \otimes \mathbb{K}^n$ with $\mathbb{K}^{mn}$ via the mapping $\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j \mapsto \mathbf{e}_{n(i-1)+j}$, we define the HWM $D = \langle \mathbb{K}^m \otimes \mathbb{K}^n, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot, \boldsymbol{\delta}\rangle$ by

- $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}^x = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x \otimes \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^x$ *for all* $x \in \Sigma$
- $(\mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{b}_1) \odot (\mathbf{a}_2 \otimes \mathbf{b}_2) = (\mathbf{a}_1 \odot^A \mathbf{a}_2) \otimes (\mathbf{b}_1 \odot^B \mathbf{b}_2)$ *for all* $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \in \mathbb{K}^m$ *and* $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathbb{K}^n$
- $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{\beta}$ *(i.e.* $\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top(\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}) = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{a})(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{b})$ *for any* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{K}^m$ *and* $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{K}^m$*)*

Let r_A (resp. r_B) be the series computed by A (resp. by B). Then the HWM C computes the series $r_C(G) = r_A(G) r_B(G)$, for any hypergraph G.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E, l)$ be a hypergraph, and let $\Gamma_k = [k]^{P_G}$ for any integer k. We will identify $[m] \times [n]$ with $[mn]$ via the mapping $(i, j) \mapsto n(i-1)+j$, and by extension Γ_{mn} with $\Gamma_{m\times n} = ([m] \times [n])^{P_G}$. For any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{m\times n}$ we will note (γ_1, γ_2) the only element of $\Gamma_m \times \Gamma_n$ satisfying $\gamma(\cdot) = (\gamma_1(\cdot), \gamma_2(\cdot))$.

First note that for any hyperedge $h \in E$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma_{m\times n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \bigodot_{(i,j)\in\gamma(h)} (\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j) &= \boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \left[\left(\bigodot_{i\in\gamma_1(h)}^{A} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \otimes \left(\bigodot_{j\in\gamma_2(h)}^{B} \mathbf{e}_j \right) \right] \\ &= \left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma_1(h)}^{A} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \bigodot_{j\in\gamma_2(h)}^{B} \mathbf{e}_j \right)\end{aligned}$$

Then, note that for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{m\times n}$, we have

$$\mathfrak{D}_\gamma = \prod_{v\in V} \mathfrak{D}^{l(v)}_{\gamma(v,1)\cdots\gamma(v,\sharp v)} = \prod_{v\in V} \mathcal{A}^{l(v)}_{\gamma_1(v,1),\cdots,\gamma_1(v,\sharp v)} \mathcal{B}^{l(v)}_{\gamma_2(v,1),\cdots,\gamma_2(v,\sharp v)} = \mathcal{A}_{\gamma_1} \mathcal{B}_{\gamma_2}$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_D(G) &= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \mathfrak{D}_\gamma \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \bigodot_{(i,j)\in\gamma(h)} (\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma_1\in\Gamma_m} \sum_{\gamma_2\in\Gamma_n} \mathcal{A}_{\gamma_1} \mathcal{B}_{\gamma_2} \prod_{h\in E} \left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{i\in\gamma_1(h)}^{A} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \bigodot_{j\in\gamma_2(h)}^{B} \mathbf{e}_j \right) = r_A(G) r_B(G) \end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, the next proposition shows that any recognizable real valued series on closed graphs can be computed by a HWM with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$ using the identity product $\odot_{id}$ and the vector $\mathbf{1}$.

Proposition 6. *Let $A = \langle \mathbb{R}^d, \{\mathcal{A}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot_A, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle$ be a HWM. There exists a HWM $B = \langle \mathbb{C}^d, \{\mathcal{B}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot_{id}, \mathbf{1} \rangle$ such that $r_B(G) = r_A(G)$ for any closed graph G.*

Proof. We consider the decomposition $\mathcal{A}^x = \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r^{(x,1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{a}_r^{(x,\sharp x)}$ for each $x \in \Sigma$ (see Remark 4). Let $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ be the matrix defined by $\mathbf{M}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top(\mathbf{e}_i \odot_A \mathbf{e}_j)$ and check that $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top(\mathbf{u} \odot_A \mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top(\mathbf{u} \odot_{id} \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{v}$ for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times d}$ be such that $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q}$ (such a decomposition exists since $\mathbf{M}$ is symmetric) and let $\mathcal{B}^x = \sum_{r=1}^R (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{a}_r^{(x,1)}) \otimes \cdots \otimes (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{a}_r^{(x,\sharp x)})$. For any closed graph $G = (V, E, \ell)$, it follows from Remark 4 that

$$\begin{aligned} r_B(G) &= \prod_{\substack{h\in E,\\ h=\{(v,i),(w,j)\}}} \mathbf{1}^\top \left[\left(\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{a}_r^{(\ell(v),i)} \right) \odot_{id} \left(\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{a}_r^{(\ell(w),j)} \right) \right] \\ &= \prod_{\substack{h\in E,\\ h=\{(v,i),(w,j)\}}} \left(\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r^{(\ell(v),i)} \right)^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} \left(\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r^{(\ell(w),j)} \right) \\ &= \prod_{\substack{h\in E,\\ h=\{(v,i),(w,j)\}}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \left[\left(\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r^{(\ell(v),i)} \right) \odot_A \left(\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbf{a}_r^{(\ell(w),j)} \right) \right] = r_A(G). \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Recognizability of Finite Support Series

In this section, we show that finite support series (or *polynomials*: series for which the set of hypergraphs with non-zero value is finite) are not recognizable in general, but we exhibit a wide class of families of hypergraphs for which they are.

First, we show on a simple example why polynomials are not recognizable for all families of hypergraphs. Consider the family of circular strings over a one letter alphabet $\Sigma = \{a\}$ introduced in Example 4 and Remark 3. The following lemma implies that the series r, defined by $r(G_a) = 1$ and $r(G_{a^k}) = 0$ for all integer $k > 1$, is not recognizable. Indeed, r would be such that $r(G_{a^k}) = Tr(\mathbf{M}_a^k) = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$, but it then follows from Lemma 1 that $r(G_a) = Tr(\mathbf{M}_a) = 0$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. If $Tr(\mathbf{M}^k) = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$, then $Tr(\mathbf{M}) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_p \in \mathbb{C}$ be the distinct non zero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}$, with multiplicities $n_1, \ldots, n_p$. The matrix $\mathbf{N} = (\lambda_i^j)_{i\in[p],2\leq j\leq p+1}$ is full rank: its determinant is equal to $\prod_i \lambda_i^2 \prod_{i<j}(\lambda_j - \lambda_i)$. We have $(n_1, \ldots, n_p)\mathbf{N} = \big(Tr(\mathbf{M}^2), \ldots, Tr(\mathbf{M}^{p+1})\big) = (0, \cdots, 0)$. Therefore, the unique eigenvalue of $\mathbf{M}$ is equal to 0 and hence, $Tr(\mathbf{M}) = 0$. □

This example illustrates the fact that the computation of a HWM on a hypergraph G is done independently on each hyperedge of G. This implies that if two hypergraphs are not distinguishable by just looking at the ports involved in their hyperedges, the computations of a HWM on these two hypergraphs are strongly dependent. This is clear if we consider a hypergraph G_1 made of two copies of a hypergraph G_2 (i.e. G_1 has two connected components, which are both isomorphic to G_2): we have $r(G_1) = r(G_2)^2$ for any HWM r (see Remark 5).

The following section formally introduces the notion of *tiling* of a hypergraph G and show how this relation between hypergraphs relates to the question of the recognizability of polynomials.

4.1 Tilings

A *tiling* of a hypergraph $\widehat{G}$ is a hypergraph G, built on the same alphabet and made of copies of $\widehat{G}$. More precisely,

Definition 5. *Let $\widehat{G} = (\widehat{V}, \widehat{E}, \widehat{l})$ be a hypergraph over a ranked alphabet $(\Sigma, \sharp)$. A hypergraph $G = (V, E, l)$ on the same alphabet $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ is a* tiling *of $\widehat{G}$ if and only if there exists a mapping $f : V \to \widehat{V}$ such that*

(i) $l(v) = \widehat{l}(f(v))$ for any $v \in V$

(ii) the mapping $g : P_G \to P_{\widehat{G}}$ defined by $g(v, i) = (f(v), i)$ is such that for all $h \in E$: $g(h) \in \widehat{E}$ and the restriction $g_{|h}$ of g to h is bijective.

The following proposition shows that for a connected hypergraph, this formal definition of tiling is equivalent to the intuition of a hypergraph made of copies of the original one.

Let $G = (V, E, l)$ be a tiling of the connected hypergraph $\widehat{G} = (\widehat{V}, \widehat{E}, \widehat{l})$, let $\sim_V$ be the equivalence relation defined on V by $v \sim_V v'$ iff $f(v) = f(v')$, and let $\sim_E$ be the equivalence relation defined on E by $h \sim_E h'$ iff $g(h) = g(h')$ where f and g are the mappings defined above. Clearly, $v \sim_V v'$ entails that $l(v) = l(v')$ and it can easily be shown that $h \sim_E h'$ iff $\exists v^{(i)} \in h, v'^{(i)} \in h'$ such that $v \sim_V v'$. We can thus define the quotient hypergraph $\overline{G} = (V/\sim_V, E/\sim_E, l)$.

Proposition 7. *If $G = (V, E, l)$ is a tiling of a connected hypergraph $\widehat{G} = (\widehat{V}, \widehat{E}, \widehat{l})$, then $\overline{G} = (V/\sim_V, E/\sim_E, l)$ is isomorphic to $\widehat{G}$ and moreover, for any $\hat{v} \in \widehat{V}$, the cardinal of $f^{-1}(\{\hat{v}\})$ is a constant.*



Figure 4: A tiling made of three copies of the hypergraph from Example 1

Proof. We will prove the last part of the proposition, which entails the surjectivity of f. This will be enough since if f is surjective, then $\overline{G}$ is isomorphic to $\widehat{G}$.

Let m be the maximal cardinality of the sets $f^{-1}(\{\widehat{v}\})$ and suppose that they have different cardinalities. Let $V_1 = \{\widehat{v} \in \widehat{V} : Card(f^{-1}(\{\widehat{v}\})) = m\}$ and $V_2 = \widehat{V} \backslash V_1$. Since $\widehat{G}$ is connected, there exists a hyperedge $\widehat{h}$ and $\widehat{v}_1^{(i)}, \widehat{v}_2^{(j)} \in \widehat{h}$ such that $\widehat{v}_1 \in V_1$ and $\widehat{v}_2 \in V_2$. Let $f^{-1}(\{\widehat{v}_1\}) = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ and let $h_1, \dots, h_m \in E$ be the hyperedges containing $v_1^{(i)}, \dots, v_m^{(i)}$, respectively. Since each $g_{|h_i}$ is injective and since the vertices $v_1, \dots, v_m$ are distinct, the hyperedges $h_1, \dots, h_m$ are also distinct and therefore disjoint. Let $w_1^{(j)} = g_{|h_1}^{-1}(\widehat{v}_2^{(j)}), \dots, w_m^{(j)} = g_{|h_m}^{-1}(\widehat{v}_2^{(j)})$. These ports are distinct and therefore, the vertices $w_1, \dots, w_m$ are also distinct. Since, $f(w_1) = \cdots = f(w_m) = \widehat{v}_2$, we obtain a contradiction. □

4.2 Finite Support Series and Tilings

We end this section with the main result of this paper. We show that we can construct a HWM which assigns a nonzero value to a specific hypergraph over some ranked alphabet and all of its tilings, and zero to any other hypergraph on the same alphabet. This result leads to a sufficient condition on families of hypergraphs for the recognizability of finite support series.

Theorem 1. *Given a hypergraph $\widehat{G} = (\widehat{V}, \widehat{E}, \widehat{l})$ over $(\Sigma, \sharp)$, there exists a recognizable series $r_{\widehat{G}}$ such that $r_{\widehat{G}}(G) \neq 0$ if and only if G is a tiling of $\widehat{G}$.*

Proof. Let $P_{\widehat{G}}$ be the set of ports of $\widehat{G}$. For any symbol $x \in \Sigma$, we note $\widehat{V}(x)$ the set of vertices in $\widehat{V}$ labelled by x.

Let $\mathcal{S} = 2^{P_{\widehat{G}}}$ bet the set of subsets of $P_{\widehat{G}}$ and let $d = |\mathcal{S}|$. Instead of indexing the canonical basis of $\mathbb{K}^d$ with integers in $[d]$, we will index it with elements of $\mathcal{S}$. For example, for each port $(\hat{v}, i) \in P_{\widehat{G}}$, the singleton $\{(\hat{v}, i)\}$ is in $\mathcal{S}$, thus $\mathbf{e}_{\{(\hat{v},i)\}}$ is a basis vector (which we will note $\mathbf{e}_{(\hat{v},i)}$ for convenience).

Define the HWM $M = \langle \mathbb{K}^d, \{\mathfrak{T}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle$ by

$$\mathfrak{T}^x = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_\emptyset{}^{\otimes \sharp x} & \text{if } \widehat{V}(x) = \emptyset \\ \sum_{\hat{v}\in\widehat{V}(x)} \mathbf{e}_{(\hat{v},1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{e}_{(\hat{v},\sharp\hat{v})} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{e}_S \odot \mathbf{e}_T = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{S\cup T} & \text{if } S \neq \emptyset, T \neq \emptyset \text{ and } S \cap T = \emptyset \\ \mathbf{e}_\emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_S = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S \in \widehat{E} \quad \text{(note that } \emptyset \notin \widehat{E}\text{)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for any $x \in \Sigma$ and $S, T \in \mathcal{S}$. Let r be the series computed by M, we claim that r satisfies the property of the theorem.

For any hypergraph $G = (V, E, l)$ with $V = \{v_1, \cdots, v_N\}$, we have

$$r(G) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \mathfrak{T}_\gamma \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{S\in\gamma(h)} e_S$$

where $\Gamma = \mathcal{S}^{P_G}$ and $\mathfrak{T}_\gamma = \prod_{i=1}^N \mathfrak{T}^{v_i}_{\gamma(v_i,1),\cdots,\gamma(v_i,\sharp v_i)}$. Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$. If there exists a port $p \in P_G$ such that $\gamma(p) = \emptyset$, then $\prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{S\in\gamma(h)} e_S = 0$; otherwise, it follows from the definition of the tensors $\mathfrak{T}^x$ that $\mathfrak{T}_\gamma$ is different from 0 if and only if for all $v \in V$, there exists $\widehat{v} \in \widehat{V}(l(v))$ s.t. $\gamma(v, i) = (\widehat{v}, i)$ for all $i \in [\sharp v]$, hence

$$r(G) = \sum_{\widehat{v}_1\in\widehat{V}(l(v_1))} \cdots \sum_{\widehat{v}_N\in\widehat{V}(l(v_N))} \prod_{i=1}^N \mathfrak{T}^{v_i}_{(\widehat{v}_i,1)\cdots(\widehat{v}_i,\sharp\widehat{v}_i))} \prod_{h\in E} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{(v_j,i_j)\in h} \mathbf{e}_{(\widehat{v}_j,i_j)}$$

We have $r(G) \neq 0$ if and only if there exist N vertices $\widehat{v}_i \in \widehat{V}(l(v_i))$ for $i \in [N]$ such that (i) $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bigodot_{(v_j,i_j)\in h} \mathbf{e}_{(\widehat{v}_j,i_j)} \neq 0$ for all $h \in E$. Let $f : V \to \widehat{V}$ and $g : P_G \to P_{\widehat{G}}$ be the mappings defined by $f(v_i) = \widehat{v}_i$ and $g(v_i, j) = (\widehat{v}_i, j)$ for all $i \in [N]$. It follows from the definitions of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\odot$ that (i) is true if and only if $g(h) \in \widehat{E}$ for all $h \in E$, and there are no distinct $(v_j, i_j), (v_k, i_k)$ in a hyperedge $h \in E$ such that $(\widehat{v}_j, i_j) = (\widehat{v}_k, i_k)$, i.e. the restriction $g_{|h}$ is injective for any $h \in E$. □

A family $\mathcal{H}$ of hypergraphs is *tiling-free* if and only if for any $G \in \mathcal{H}$, there are no (non-trivial) tiling of G in $\mathcal{H}$.

Corollary 1. *For any tiling-free family of hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}$, finite support series on $\mathcal{H}$ are recognizable.*

Proof. Let $r_{\widehat{G}}$ be the series from the previous proof, and let $z = r_{\widehat{G}}(\widehat{G})$. For any scalar y, if we change the definition of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathbf{e}_S) = (y/z)^{1/|\widehat{E}|}$ if $S \in \widehat{E}$ and 0 otherwise, we have $r_{\widehat{G}}(\widehat{G}) = y$. The corollary then directly follows from the previous theorem and Proposition 4. □

Remark 6. *A simple example of tiling-free family is the family of rooted hypergraphs: hypergraphs on a ranked alphabet $(\Sigma \cup \{\lambda\}, \sharp)$, where the special* root *symbol λ appears exactly once.*

5 Examples

In this section, we present some examples of recognizable hypergraph series in order to give some insight on the expressiveness of HWMs and on how their computation relates to the usual notion of recognizable series on strings and trees.

5.1 Rooted Circular Strings

First note that the family of circular strings is not tiling-free: the circular string $abab$ is a tiling of ab. Instead of the construction described in Example 2, we can map each string w on a finite alphabet Σ to a *rooted circular string*. Let $w = w_1 \cdots w_n \in \Sigma^*$, we will consider the circular string G_w on the ranked alphabet $(\Sigma \cup \{\lambda\}, \sharp)$ where $\sharp x = 2$ for any $x \in \Sigma \cup \{\lambda\}$, with vertices $V = \{0, \cdots, n\}$, labels $l(0) = \lambda$ and $l(i) = w_i$ for $i \in [n]$, and edges $\{(n, 2), (0, 1)\}$ and $\{(i, 2), (i + 1, 1)\}$ for $i \in \{0, \cdots, n - 1\}$ (see Figure 5).

Let $r = \langle \mathbb{R}^d, \boldsymbol{\iota}, \{\mathbf{M}_\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}\rangle$ be a rational series on Σ^*. We define the HWM $A = \langle \mathbb{R}^d, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot_{id}, \mathbf{1}\rangle$ where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma = \mathbf{M}_\sigma$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^\lambda = \boldsymbol{\iota}\boldsymbol{\tau}^\top$. It is easy to check that $r_A(G_w) = r(w)$ for all $w \in \Sigma^*$.

Now consider m rational series on Σ^* with d-dimensional linear representations $\langle \boldsymbol{\iota}_i, \{\mathbf{M}_\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_i\rangle$ for $i \in [m]$. The string series $r = r_1 + \cdots + r_m$ is rational and its dimension can be as high as dm. However, the HWM $A = \langle \mathbb{R}^d, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^x\}_{x\in\Sigma}, \odot_{id}, \mathbf{1}\rangle$ where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma = \mathbf{M}_\sigma$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m \boldsymbol{\iota}_i\boldsymbol{\tau}_i^\top$ is such that $r_A(G_w) = r(w)$ for all $w \in \Sigma^*$, and is of dimension d.

5.2 Recognizing $a^n b^n$

Given an even length string on the alphabet $\{a, b\}$, we can enrich the construction described in Example 2 by associating a vertex of arity 3 to each letter, and adding extra edges connecting letters in the first half of the string to letters in the second half. Formally, given a word $w_1 \cdots w_{2n}$ on Σ, we consider the *3-ary graph representation* of w given by the graph $G = (V, E, l)$ on the ranked alphabet $(\Sigma \cup \{\iota, \tau\}, \sharp)$ where $\sharp\iota = \sharp\tau = 1$, $\sharp\sigma = 3$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $V = \{0 \cdots 2n + 1\}$, $l(0) = \iota$, $l(2n+1) = \tau$, $l(i) = w_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, and the set of edges is composed of $\{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}$, $\{(i, 2), (i+1, 1)\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$ and $\{(i, 3), (n+i, 3)\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The 3-ary graph representation of the string $abaa$ is shown in Figure 5.

Using this construction, it is easy to show that there exists a HWM (on the family of 3-ary graph representations of even length strings) whose support is the set of 3-ary graph representations of the language $\{a^n b^n : n \geq 1\}$.

5.3 Crosswords

Let $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ be a ranked alphabet where all symbols have arity 4. An (M, N)-crossword w on Σ is an array of symbols $[w_{ij}]_{ij} \in \Sigma^{M\times N}$. The graph $G_w = (V, E, l)$ associated to the crossword w is the graph with vertices $V = [M] \times [N]$, $l(m, n) = w_{mn}$, and edges $E = E_H \cup E_V$, where the ports are labeled by W, E, N, S, in this order, and where

$$E_H = \bigcup_{m\in[M],n\in[N-1]} \left\{\{(m, n)^E, (m, n + 1)^W\}\right\} \bigcup_{m\in[M]} \left\{\{(m, 1)^W\}, \{(m, N)^E\}\right\}$$

and

$$E_V = \bigcup_{n\in[N],m\in[M-1]} \left\{\{(m, n)^S, (m + 1, n)^N\}\right\} \bigcup_{n\in[N]} \left\{\{(1, n)^N\}, \{(M, n)^S\}\right\}.$$

An example of graph associated to a 2D word is shown in Figure 5. Now, let $\#_1$ be a new arity function, such that all symbols of Σ have arity 2. The graph G_w can be decomposed in two graphs over $(\Sigma, \#_1)$: $G_w^H = (V, E_H, l)$ where the ports are labeled W, E in this order and $G_w^V = (V, E_V, l)$ where the ports are labeled N, S in this order.

Theorem 2. *Given $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \odot_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_1\rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathbb{R}^{d_2}, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \odot_2, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2\rangle$, two HWMs over $(\Sigma, \#_1)$, there exists a HWM $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}, \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}^\sigma\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}, \odot, \boldsymbol{\beta}\rangle$ over $(\Sigma, \sharp)$ such that*

$$r_{\mathcal{C}}(G_w) = r_{\mathcal{A}}(G_w^H) \times r_{\mathcal{B}}(G_w^V)$$

for any (M, N)-crossword w.

Proof. Let $(\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{d_1}, \mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_{d_2})$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}$. The HWM C is defined by

- $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma \otimes \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^\sigma = \left(\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_{\sharp\sigma} \in [d_1]} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{i_1,\dots,i_{\sharp\sigma}} \mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \dots \mathbf{e}_{i_{\sharp\sigma}}\right) \otimes \left(\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_{\sharp\sigma} \in [d_2]} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{i_1,\dots,i_{\sharp\sigma}} \mathbf{f}_{i_1} \otimes \dots \mathbf{f}_{i_{\sharp\sigma}}\right)$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma$
- $\mathbf{e}_i \odot \mathbf{e}_j = \mathbf{e}_i \odot_1 \mathbf{e}_j, \mathbf{f}_i \odot \mathbf{f}_j = \mathbf{f}_i \odot_2 \mathbf{f}_j$ and $\mathbf{e}_i \odot \mathbf{f}_j = \mathbf{f}_j \odot \mathbf{e}_i = 0$ for any indices i, j
- $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

By definition, we have

$$r_{\mathcal{C}}(G_w) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{C}_\gamma \prod_{h \in E} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \bigodot_{i \in \gamma(h)} \mathbf{g}_i$$

where $\mathbf{g}_i = \mathbf{e}_i$ if $i \in [d_1]$ and $\mathbf{f}_i$ otherwise. Let $\Gamma_H = [d_1]^{P_{G_w^H}}$ and $\Gamma_V = [d_2]^{P_{G_w^V}}$. It is easy to check that any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ for which $\mathfrak{C}_\gamma \neq 0$ can be associated with a tuple $(\gamma_H, \gamma_V) \in \Gamma_H \times \Gamma_V$ satisfying $\mathfrak{C}_\gamma = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\gamma_H} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{\gamma_V}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\mathcal{C}}(G_w) &= \sum_{\gamma_H \in \Gamma_H} \sum_{\gamma_V \in \Gamma_V} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\gamma_H} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{\gamma_V} \prod_{h \in E_H} \boldsymbol{\beta}_1^\top \left(\bigodot_{1 \atop i \in \gamma_H(h)} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \times \prod_{h \in E_V} \boldsymbol{\beta}_2^\top \left(\bigodot_{2 \atop i \in \gamma_V(h)} \mathbf{f}_i \right) \\ &= r_{\mathcal{A}}(G_w^H) \times r_{\mathcal{B}}(G_w^V). \end{aligned}$$

□

Given a (M, N)-crossword w, we note $w_{m:}$ for the m-th row of w and $w_{:n}$ for its n-th column.

Corollary 2. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, \{\mathbf{A}^\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_\infty \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathbb{R}^{d_2}, \{\mathbf{B}^\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\infty \rangle$ be two rational string series on Σ^*.*

There exists a HWM $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathbb{C}^{d_1+d_2}, \{\mathfrak{C}^\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}, \odot, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle$ such that

$$r_{\mathcal{C}}(G_w) = \prod_{m \in [M]} r_{\mathcal{A}}(w_{m:}) \prod_{n \in [N]} r_{\mathcal{B}}(w_{:n})$$

for any (M, N)-crossword w.

Proof. The result directly follows from Proposition 2 and Theorem 2, and remarking that the HWM $\mathcal{M}_H$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_V$) that computes $r_{\mathcal{A}}$ (resp. $r_{\mathcal{B}}$) satisfies $\mathcal{M}_H(G_w^H) = \prod_{m \in [M]} r_{\mathcal{A}}(w_{m:})$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_V(G_w^V) = \prod_{n \in [N]} r_{\mathcal{B}}(w_{:n})$) since the graphs G_w^H (resp. G_w^V) has M (resp. N) connected components. □

6 Conclusion

The model we propose naturally generalizes recognizable series on strings and trees. It satisfies closure properties by sum and Hadamard product. We have analysed why finite support series on some families of hypergraphs are not recognizable, and we exhibit a sufficient condition on families of hypergraph for the recognizability of finite support series.

Since many data over a variety of fields naturally present a graph structure (images, secondary structure of RNA in bioinformatics, dependency graphs in NLP, etc.), this computational model offers a broad range of applications.

The next theoretical step will be to study how learning can be achieved within this framework, i.e. how the tensor components of the model M can be recovered or estimated from samples of the form $(G_1, \widehat{r_M(G_1)}), \dots, (G_n, \widehat{r_M(G_n)})$. Preliminary results on circular strings indicate that this is a



Figure 5: (left) Rooted circular string, (right) graph associated to the 2D-word $\begin{smallmatrix} aca \\ dbb \end{smallmatrix}$ and (bottom) graph associated to the string *abaa* with extra edges connecting u_n to u_{2+n}.

promising direction. General learning algorithms should rely on tensor decomposition techniques, which generalize the spectral methods used for learning rational series on strings and trees. We also plan to tackle algorithmic issues and to study how techniques and methods developed in the field of graphical models, such as message passing, variational methods, etc., could be adapted to the setting of HWMs.

References

[1] R. Bailly, F. Denis, and G. Rabusseau. Recognizable series on hypergraphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.7533*, 2014.

[2] R. Bailly, F. Denis, and L. Ralaivola. Grammatical inference as a principal component analysis problem. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2009.

[3] J. Berstel and C. Reutenauer. Recognizable formal power series on trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 18(2), 1982.

[4] J. Berstel and C. Reutenauer. *Rational series and their languages*. Springer-Verlag, 1988.

[5] A. Cichocki. Era of big data processing: A new approach via tensor networks and tensor decompositions. In *International Workshop on Smart Info-Media Systems in Asia*, 2013.

[6] H. Comon, M. Dauchet, R. Gilleron, C. Löding, F. Jacquemard, D. Lugiez, S. Tison, and M. Tommasi. Tree automata techniques and applications, 2007.

[7] F. Denis and A. Habrard. Learning rational stochastic tree languages. In *Proceedings of the 18th international conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 2007.

[8] M. Droste, W. Kuich, and H. Vogler. *Handbook of weighted automata*. Springer, 2009.

[9] S. Eilenberg. *Automata, languages, and machines*. Academic press, 1974.

[10] W. Hackbusch. *Tensor spaces and numerical tensor calculus*. Springer, 2012.

[11] W. Kuich and A. Salomaa. *Semirings, automata, languages*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, 1986.

[12] R. Orus. A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.2164"*, 2013.

[13] A. Pellionisz and R. Llinas. Brain modeling by tensor network theory and computer simulation. the cerebellum: Distributed processor for predictive coordination. *Neuroscience*, 4(3), 1979.

[14] J. Sakarovitch. *Elements of automata theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[15] A. Salomaa, M. Soittola, F. L. Bauer, and D. Gries. *Automata-theoretic aspects of formal power series*. Springer, 1978.

[16] M. P. Schützenberger. On the definition of a family of automata. *Information and control*, (2), 1961.